

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed September 15, 2009.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 7-9 have been amended to depend on allowed claim 12, and claim 10 has been amended to depend on claim 1. Further, claim 13 has been amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Lastly, new claims 14-22 have been added to direct to other specific embodiments of allowed claim 12. Thus, claims 1, 3-5, and 7-22 are currently pending in this application. Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims, see, in particular, original claims 2-5 and 7-9.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant believes that the amendment to claim 13 overcomes this rejection by deleting the term "*generally*" from the claim. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 5, 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Gaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,318,647 B1) and in further view of Valaskovic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,046 B2). Further, claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Gaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,318,647 B1) and in further view of Valaskovic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,046 B2), and Westerweck et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0057720). Still further, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Gaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,318,647 B1) and in further view of Valaskovic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,046 B2), and Coffee et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,595,208 B1). Still further, claim 8 is rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Gaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,318,647 B1) and in further view of Valaskovic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,046 B2), and Doebl et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0100815). Lastly, claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Gaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,318,647 B1) and in further view of Valaskovic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,046 B2), and Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,512,228). These rejections have been overcome by the amendments to claims 1 and 7-9 to depend on allowed claim 12.

More specifically, in view of the claim amendments to claims 1 and 7-9, dependent claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, and 13 now depend directly or indirectly from allowed claim 12 and include all of the features of allowed claim 12. Therefore, Applicant submits that dependent claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, and 13 are now allowable at least for the reasons that independent claim 12 is allowed, as well as for the features they recite.

Thus, withdrawal of the present rejections is respectfully requested.

### New Claims

With regard to new claims 14-22, Applicant submits that these new claims are also allowable since these claims have been presented to omit only the claimed elements relating to the selector and its associated features which Applicant believes are not essential to the patentable subject matter of allowed claim 12. Thus, Applicant believes that new claims 14-22 are allowable for the same reasons that claim 12 has been allowed.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: December 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Lee Cheng  
Registration No.: 40,949  
CHENG LAW GROUP, PLLC  
1100 17th Street, N.W.  
Suite 503  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 530-1280  
Attorney for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4422 for any such fees; and Applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.